



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/657,696 | 09/08/2003 | Douglas J. Menkedick | 8266-0880 | 1212 |
| 25267 | 7590 | 02/08/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| BOSE MCKINNEY & EVANS LLP 135 N PENNSYLVANIA ST SUITE 2700 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204 | | | | SANTOS, ROBERT G |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | 3673 | | |

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|
| Application No. | 10/657,696 | |
| Examiner | Art Unit Robert G. Santos | |
| | 3673 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-50 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-22, drawn to a patient support comprising an intermediate frame movable relative to a base frame, classified in class 5, subclass 611.
 - II. Claims 23-36, drawn to a patient support comprising a mattress support deck including a foot section movably coupled to a seat section, classified in class 5, subclass 618.
 - III. Claims 37-43, drawn to a patient support comprising a mattress support deck including a back section movably coupled to a seat section, classified in class 5, subclass 617.
 - IV. Claims 44-50, drawn to a patient support comprising a foot end having a rotatable element positioned thereon, classified in class 5, subclass 624.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, since the intermediate and base frames of Invention I are movable relative to each other generally in a vertical manner whereas the foot and seat sections of Invention II are movably coupled to each other essentially along a horizontal

axis, and different effects, since the entire body of a user is supported and selectively raised or lowered by the intermediate frame of Invention I while only the lower body portions of the user are articulated by movement of the seat and foot sections of Invention II relative to each other.

3. Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, since the intermediate and base frames of Invention I are movable relative to each other generally in a vertical manner whereas the back and seat sections of Invention III are movably coupled to each other essentially along a horizontal axis, and different effects, since the entire body of a user is supported and selectively raised or lowered by the intermediate frame of Invention I while only the upper body portions of the user are articulated by movement of the back and seat sections of Invention III relative to each other.

4. Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, since the intermediate frame of Invention I is selectively raised or lowered to position the body of a user at a desired height while the rotatable element positioned on the foot end of the frame of Invention IV is primarily designed to engage an obstacle.

5. Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions II and III have different effects since the lower body portions of the user are articulated by movement of the seat and foot sections of Invention II relative to each other whereas the upper body portions of the user are articulated by movement of the back and seat sections of Invention III relative to each other.

6. Inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, since the seat and foot sections of Invention II are movable relative to each other in order to articulate the lower body portions of a user positioned thereon while the rotatable element positioned on the foot end of the frame of Invention IV is primarily designed to engage an obstacle.

7. Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, since the back and seat sections of Invention III are movable relative to each other in order to articulate the upper body portions of a user positioned

thereon while the rotatable element positioned on the foot end of the frame of Invention IV is primarily designed to engage an obstacle.

8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

9. A telephone call was made to Douglas A. Yerkeson on February 4, 2005 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert G. Santos whose telephone number is (703) 308-7469. The examiner can normally be reached on Tues-Fr and first Mondays, 10:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather C. Shackelford can be reached on (703) 308-2978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Robert G. Santos
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3673

R.S.
February 4, 2005